REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the non-final Office Action of August 19, 2009 in which claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30 and 33-39 were rejected.

Amendments

The claims have been amended in order to overcome the objections and rejections raised by the Office. In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to recite the file as comprising items of different media types and that the file is stored on a device. Corresponding amendments have been made to device Claim 15 and computer-readable storage medium Claim 30. Device Claim 39 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Method Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the source application, target application and tracing application are all located on the device, as is the case in device Claim 15. A similar amendment has been made to Claim 30.

The first two paragraphs of Claim 1 have been amended to simplify and clarify the claimed method. The language is similar to that used in the original claims. Similar amendments have been made to Claims 15 and 30.

Claim 37 has been cancelled.

Claim Objections

The Office objects to Claim 30 on the basis that "recorder" should be "recorded". The claim has been amended accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Office rejects claims 1 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 with respect to the phrase "detecting a latest operation relating to a source application of at least one source application". The amendments to Claim 1 overcome this objection. In particular, Claim 1 now recites, "...tracing a latest operation relating to a source application..." which finds support in the original application as filed, including page 8, lines 13-26. Claim 39 has been cancelled. Withdrawal of this objection to the claims is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Office rejects claims 1 - 3, 5 - 16, 18 - 30, 33, 34 and 37 - 39 under 35 U.S.C. section 102 (b) as being anticipated by *Johnson* (US 6,005,928). Claims 1, 15 and 30 have been amended in order to overcome this rejection. Specifically, each claim has been amended to specify that the items are of different media types. The feature was previously recited in Claim 37, amongst others.

Each of the independent claims now recite "wherein said file comprises items of different media types" or similar wording. One of the aims of the present invention is to provide a copy-paste tool which operates with different media types (page 4, lines 4 to 6). This is now specifically recited in Claims 1, 15 and 30.

The Office has alleged that *Johnson* discloses this feature. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. The first previously presented claim which recites this feature is Claim 13. This Claim specifies that the items can be "image, audio, video, text, uniform resource location, phonebook entry, music, calendar event, wallet and error message". The Office suggests that col. 5, lines 54 - 67 of *Johnson* discloses this feature. However, this paragraph refers to different services which can be tracked. It specifies that the services can be pager, printer, fax, E-mail, phone call etc. These are different services, not different items. There is certainly no disclosure of items of different media types.

The Office appears to be suggesting that the services types could be considered as "media". However, Claim 1 does not refer generally to different media in the sense of different services. Instead it refers specifically to the nature of the stored items. The items are specified as being things which are obtained from operations and which are stored in a file. A "phone call" or "fax" can not, *per se*, be considered to be an item in the context of Claim 1.

Further, if any part of the disclosure of *Johnson* was to be considered to be an "item", this would be the address data stored in ADD 122, as appreciated by the Office. These, "items" are certainly not of different media types (in the context of images, videos etc).

In addition to the above comments, it should also be noted that Claims 1, 15 and 30 each require that the source application, tracing application and target application are located on the same device. The system shown in *Johnson* is clearly a distributed one in which the ADD 122 and AB 120 are connected to a LAN in a server fashion. There is no device disclosed in *Johnson* which has the three applications noted above located on it.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 15, and 30 are not anticipated by Johnson. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 3, 5-14, 16, 18-29, 33, 34, and 38 are also believed to be neither anticipated nor suggested by Johnson at least in view of their ultimate dependency from an independent claim which is believed to be allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

At pages 10-11, claim 35 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson further in view of US patent application publication 2006/0155811, Goh, et al. Claim 35 depends from amended claim 1 and is believed to be allowable at least in view of such dependency.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson further in view of US patent application publication 2005/0028008, Kumar. Claim 36 also depends from amended claim 1 and is believed to be allowable at least in view of such dependency.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of August 19 2009 have been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, and withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30 and 33-39 to issue is solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: <u>November 18, 2009</u>

<u>/Alfred A. Fressola/</u>

Alfred A. Fressola
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,550

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
    & ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955